THE PHILIPPINE PROBLEM

Voice of the People

An Anti-Imperialistic View

SIR,—Your recent invitation to your readers to write their views emboldens me to address you. It was a great pleasure to me to read your editorial on the question of the Philippines, the more so because of late your articles have not been, in my judgment, entirely free from a certain one-sidedness. Allow me to congratulate you, then, on your able and fair presentation of the views of both sides.

For some time the WEEKLY has not been willing to allow that Anti-Imperialists had any case at all. They have been contemptuously waved aside by such words as the Tooley Club, Atkinsonians, and so forth, implying that the sentiment of Anti-Imperialism is confined to a set of discontented Bostonians. Allow me to remind you, sir, that it is not thus that great questions are settled, and that it is not dignified for a paper such as yours to call so large a body of conscientious, patriotic citizens names.

No name was too vile for an abolitionist in the early days, but now we honor those men who set their conscientious beliefs high above desire for the good opinion of their fellows.

Contemptuously to sneer at a man is not argument, nor does it strengthen one's side. When such men as ex-Presidents Harrison and Cleveland, Mr. Hoar, and Mark Twain declare that our present course is wrong and utterly foreign to American ideals, they cannot be ridden over rough-shod, nor waved aside by a sneer.

As for myself, I care not which side you take, but it is of importance to the WEEKLY that you should present your views in a manly, straightforward, convincing manner, and not in the fashion—if you will pardon me—of a demagogue.

There are two sides to every great question, sir, and it will not do hastily to assume that on one side are all the wise and patriotic, on the other all the fools and carpers.

If your last editorial was but the precursor of others of the same candid sort, you are to be doubly congratulated.

DUNBAR F. CARPENTER.

Cambridge, Mass.

Christianize the Filipino

SIR,—The suggestion in the HARPER'S WEEKLY of February 9 in regard to a thorough and unprejudiced consideration of the Philippine problem must appeal powerfully to every thoughtful American citizen who has at heart the honor and welfare of his country. Nothing seems to be more clearly established and more fully exemplified by the history of human progress than this: that governmental acts or enactments are effective just in proportion as they have behind them the backing, the motive force that is afforded by the approval of a sane, intelligent, but deadly earnest public sentiment. To the generation of such a sentiment what could contribute more than such an "Intellectual Revival" as you mention?

In the admirably fair analysis of the Philippine problem presented in the editorial above mentioned, emphasis is laid, justly, it seems to us, first, upon the religious or conscientious motive, and, secondly, upon the commercial motive, as being assigned by those who answer in the affirmative the question, "Do we want to keep the Philippines?" While granting full sincerity and honesty of purpose to those who advocate the retention of the Philippines on religious grounds, let us discover, if possible, upon what basis this belief is founded, and whether it constitutes any valid reason for our wishing to hold the archipelago as a dependency.

The religious motive, to have force, must proceed on the claim that under the control of the islands by the United States the Christian religion can more successfully—*i. e.*, under circumstances more likely to procure for it a favorable reception—be presented to the Filipinos than under a native government. We see no escape from this conclusion. Is this claim, then, true? Assuming the subjugation of the islands to be complete, and friendly relations to have been established between the Filipino and his conqueror, will there not remain the memory of some years of bitter, bloody, cruel strife, of towns burned and villages destroyed, of homes broken, of sons, fathers, brothers slain in the all too unequal conflict, of hopes disappointed; will not the memory of these remain to prejudice a simple-hearted people against those who come bringing a gospel of "peace on earth, good-will to men"? Will not there still persist that longing to be free which even Justinian, Roman emperor and law-giver, testified to as existing in the heart of all men? Will there not be still that deep-seated distrust ever felt by an alien and a weaker race for an alien and a stronger one?

It is evident that to secure for the spreading of Christianity and of civilization those advantageous conditions which, it is claimed, would result from the permanent control of the Philippines, a certain amount of conflict of armed forces, of war, of bloodshed, not on one side only, but on both, is necessary. Assuming now that war, involving as it does the sacrifice of human life, is always deplorable and unjust except when it cannot be avoided, does the end in view, in itself very possibly of doubtful worth, justify the means necessary, in the case in question, to accomplish it? The proposition that in general the end justifies the means needs no refutation. On that theory the crime of an Iscariot could be committed that good might result.

Furthermore, the very essence of the Christian religion is at variance with the plan not only of propagating religion, but equally of securing for it a hearing by the sword. The conquests of Christianity have not been made by force. The Christian religion has at all periods since the beginning of the Christian era possessed a remarkable vitality, a power to make its way even in the face of obstacles, but always through the channels of peace. We see no reason why the "injunction to carry the gospel into heathen lands" requires more in the Philippines than in numerous other regions of Asia and of Africa for its fulfilment, that the country be held as a dependency by the nation which would Christianize it.

Reasoning thus we fail utterly to see how the conscientious motive is able to yield any valid or weighty reason for answering in the affirmative the question, "Do we *want* to hold the Philippines as a dependency of the United States?" Clearly, the retention of the Philippines on religious grounds is neither right nor expedient.

HAVEN D. BRACKETT.

Cornwall-on-Hudson.

Give the Filipinos a Chance

SIR,—Feeling an earnest interest in an early and wise solution of the problems that confront us as a liberty-loving people, permit me to say that, from the point of view of a layman, the final annexation of the islands to this republic, which would contemplate the admission to citizenship of some millions of men of alien races, our inferiors in blood, intelligence, and virility, and participation by them in the government of *our own* land, in return for which we would acquire insular territory separated from us by more than two thousand leagues of ocean, and unfit for colonization by white men, seems the adverse of an attractive or profitable business proposition.

Looking at the trade from another point of view, it must be admitted by every thoughtful person that the complication of social and economical problems now pending solution in our own country, the settlement of which will either make for the permanence and stability of free government by a free people, or tend to disaster and despair, will be such that no one, not a pure optimist, can contemplate without a sinking heart and an earnest hope that such a contingency may be put far from us.

I believe, if we are wise, we will henceforth pursue a policy of conciliation toward "our brother in darkness," give him the opportunity he seeks to show his fitness to take care of himself, and if he proves that he is human and capable, bid him God-speed; let him work out his destiny in his own way, and repay us what we have expended on his behalf in the settlement with Spain; that done, give him a clear title to his islands, and so preserve our honor and self-respect.

B. F. HODGMAN.

Wheeling, W. Va.

An Appeal to Conscience

SIR,—Permit an old reader to express the pleasure with which he sees in his last number of your WEEKLY the invitation to a free discussion of the Philippine question. You are surely rendering another service to the cause of civilization.

I have lately read a letter from a soldier in the Philippine Islands. He tells how the men of his company shoot unknown natives on sight; how his sergeant was cheered because, on coming in sight of a Filipino in a distant field, he shot him dead—a very fine shot; how some natives, fleeing from their homes at the approach of the Americans, were wounded and left without food or drink in a deserted hut for twenty-four hours. "We were surprised to find them alive on our return," he says. This young man, the writer of the letter in question, went from a Christian home; he bears the name of an honored family; my brother, to whom the letter was written, and who served with him in the Spanish war, is amazed to find him so brutalized that he can tell these things.

But is it not the natural result of a cruel war that those who wage it lose their finer sense of right? Is not our country suffering a convulsion of mob violence? Are not negroes being burned? Is not the whipping-post seriously recommended in New England, and seriously needed? Has not Jane Addams found crimes of cruelty redoubled in frequency in the slum district of Chicago since this war began, and that, too, among the youth?

What can we expect but a stupor of conscience and a degrading of national life and character? We have deceived a people who considered us their allies till the victory was won, when we turned on them and claimed the reward—the territory as ours absolutely. We have extended our flag with its protecting folds over a race of slaveholders, and have declared that their institutions shall not be interfered with. We are making war on a weak people, while we ourselves are the strongest of nations. Our acts have been deceitful and unjust. No man and no nation can do such things without suffering degradation.

If this war continues, a just God will surely exact the price of blood at our hands. I pray, as I love my country, that He may grant to our rulers the backbone to do right at whatever cost; to grant these people their liberty, and to protect them in the enjoyment of it, though our treasury be depleted and we become the sport of kings. Let us pursue our old course of liberty and justice for all, secure that we shall thus prosper in the future, as in the past.

(REV.) STANLEY HUGHES.

Richmond, Ind.

For a Moral Protectorate

SIR,—If we had to destroy the Spanish fleet in Manila Bay to compel Spain to release Cuba,—if Admiral Dewey could not have sailed away after that battle without destroying the Spanish land forces,—if the release of the Philippines from Spanish yoke could not have been accomplished except by our purchasing from Spain the archipelago for twenty million dollars,—then we did a good work by reason of being compelled to do all that. If all we wanted by our interference in Cuba was to see an oppressed people become free, and enjoy mutually free international commercial relations, we should be the better pleased to find our success in behalf of Cuba had been extended, to the Philippines, which was equally oppressed.

Then, having by our strong hand and ready money set these people free, now let us ask from them treaty obligations in protection of life and property, favored commercial privileges, military and naval stations, and a reimbursement of money expended in their behalf. We to promise them our protection in the future, and demanding from them, in consideration of all this, that they establish and maintain a peaceful republican government. Let us lend them at their request all necessary assistance, military, educational, civil, and monetary, they may require to make it a success. Under these conditions time alone would secure the success desired. Meantime we would be the favored nation commercially, getting the benefits we seek to secure, and have no serious problem for settlement or dissension.

F. M. SLAGLE.

Alton, Iowa.

Who is Really Responsible?

SIR,—Replying to yours of the 9th inst. asking the opinions of your readers on the Philippine question, I say, keep them, as they are ours by conquest and purchase. I fully agree with Mr. Bangs when he arraigns Mr. Clemens for "his flings at the President," when we all know his efforts to avoid the conflict. I don't know who got us in all this trouble. I've heard William J. Bryan went to Washington and did all he could to bring it on, and that Joe Baily, Democratic leader in the House of Representatives, advised his associates to vote for the war, as it was good politics, and I think there must have been some truth in it, as I read in the *Congressional Record* when a prominent Western Democratic member stated on the floor that "the Republicans cannot claim all the credit of the war, for we caught you by the ears and dragged you into it." Now, Mr. Editor, this is all forgotten, and we find those who were most pronounced in advocating the war are now doing all they can to prevent its successful termination. This is neither just, honorable, nor patriotic.

B. LEMLY.

Jackson, Miss.

Begin at the Beginning

SIR,—Some of us think, with the Fathers, that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed; that we want no unwilling people subject to our power; that no solution of the Philippine questions which is worth anything is possible except such a one as is reached through allowing the absolute independence of those islands. Let us declare our intention to make them free—that is, if we have so far recovered from the intoxication of *land-lust* that we can truthfully make such a declaration. Then let us go to work to rehabilitate our damaged reputation by correcting our treatment of Porto Rico, and by active effort to reassure the Cubans, and to discredit and denounce the conspiracy now plotting to evade our sacred promise to that long-suffering people.

These are the first steps to be taken, and as you ask for reasons, I will give as such that they comport with the principles of liberty, justice, and truth.

PORTER FARLEY.

Rochester, N. Y.

A Bright Future

SIR,—I wish to record my dissent from the views expressed by Mr. Clemens on the Philippine question. It is remarkable how greatly the humorist changes when he discusses questions of national policy and writes seriously. An admirer must contemplate with sadness the spectacle of an author, almost idolized, resorting deliberately to the language of disappointed rage, such as might be expected of an ill-natured, narrow-gauged politician smarting under defeat. The exaggerations which characterize his article, as well as the misrepresentation of facts, are so patent as to destroy its whole force as an argument, to all except those extremists whose fanaticism on this subject is well known.

The abuse of Mr. McKinley is mild compared with that heaped on Washington in his day and Lincoln in his second campaign, and will doubtless be treated in the same way by posterity.

The extraordinary lucid statements of Mr. Bangs, his calm recital of simple facts, and his generous treatment of the man whose views he antagonizes, make his paper very valuable.

The Americans will deal justly with not only the Filipino minority, but with *all* the people of those islands, and the time is not far distant when they will all bless the day that cast their lot with so just a people.

FRANK SMALLEY.

Syracuse, N. Y.

A Bad Job

SIR,—It is plain that our right in the islands is either the right of purchase, the right of conquest, or both. As a result of our victory over Spain, and for consideration given, Spain transferred to this country all her rights in the Philippines, and all the rights of Spain in the islands at the time of the cession are now ours except those that we are estopped from claiming by our own acts and admissions.

The right of Spain was that of long occupation originally obtained by conquest, and weakened by misrule and resulting discontent, which our own action fanned into open and successful rebellion. For the same reasons we had declared Spain's right in Cuba forfeited, and forced Spain to withdraw.

In our war we made the Filipinos our allies, and before Spain ceded to us her rights they had possession of the whole country except the city of Manila and a few places where the Spanish forces were besieged. It is certain that the rapid if not the ultimate success of the Filipinos was due to our destruction of the Spanish fleet, but it is just as certain that our capture of the Spanish army at Manila and the fall of the Spanish power in the islands were due to the co-operation of the Filipinos. If the natives had supported Spain instead of us we would not now be in the islands.

The Filipinos were our allies, and although we did not treat them with the consideration we would have shown a military equal, that does not on moral grounds lessen the force of the fact.

Our officials fully understood the Filipino aspirations and their views of the compact, and took advantage of them to promote our military success. They were, in fact, careful not to let the Filipinos think we had any design other than to defeat Spain, and possibly exercise a protectorate. At first it is doubtful if our own officials had any other idea unless it was that we might insist on a naval station.

Considering the above facts and the change made by Otis in the President's proclamation, it does not seem fair to call them rebels and insurgents, for they never owed us allegiance, and have been fighting not to throw off but to prevent our authority being established.

Can we say that from their point of view their cause is not a just one? Their cause of rebellion against Spain was greater and more just than our cause against England, and what would we have thought and done if the result of our rebellion against England had been a great victory for France over her, and if after France had by our help got large garrisons in New York she had forced England to cede this country to her, and then had tried to enforce her authority?

The right of conquest is largely the right of might—at least without the might there can be no right of conquest. Approximately speaking, we now control in the islands only the places we garrison, and have no friends among the natives, although some are forced to appear to be so.

Circumstances may be such that the might decides the right, as when a great power and a small one are neighbors, and there are anarchy and disorder in the small one that the large country can easily suppress.

It might be the duty of the large one to do so, but it would be morally wrong for the small country to try to set matters right in the large one when an attack would probably be defeated and make the trouble greater. To make war at any time for no higher reason than that it will increase trade, or that success will add to the power and prestige of the aggressor, would be wrong. The excuse that conquest would be good for the country attacked should be urged with all modesty, and the circumstances should be so strong that there could be no question as to the honesty of the motive.

My views at first were, I believe, shared by the mass of the American people: that the Filipinos, or at least their leaders, were a bloodthirsty, treacherous, cowardly lot, and incapable of self-government; that by our destruction of the Spanish fleet we had destroyed Spain's power to control the islands, and that by this victory we had made ourselves responsible to the world for the lives and property of foreigners and respectable natives. I also thought that the job would be an easy one, as I considered the natives incapable of either civil or military government, and that they would not carry on a struggle without the prospect of loot.

The outcome shows I was mistaken, and there is evidence to show that those lurid circulars about torturing foreigners and destroying their property were manufactured and circulated by enemies of the Filipinos. These circulars that were so widely advertised had great weight in forming public opinion.

Making fair allowance, and with no more exceptions than in so-called civilized wars, the Filipinos have not been cruel, and they fought well, although not of the same stuff as our men were made of. All want to be freed from our rule, and the struggle they have made shows they are capable of a creditable future. Dewey says they are as capable of self-government as the Cubans, whom we went to war to make free and independent. We still call that a just war.

Taking the lowest view of the question, there is no doubt but that as a matter of business it has been a bad job, and it will probably never be a good one. Individuals will make fortunes, but the country as a whole will put in more dollars than it will ever take out.

Order and good government in any country mean more trade with it, but hoisting our flag does not necessarily produce the same effect.

We do our greatest trade with England, and I believe that a successful conquest of that country would not increase it.

Who is the patriot? The one who strives to have mistakes acknowledged and remedied, and wants her honor as clean as that of an honest man, or the one who thinks the country should push every wrong beginning to a successful conclusion, and that her reputation should be like that of a ward bully whose threat is always carried out?

The statement of Mr. Bangs that any one with the intelligence of a child cannot question our right in the islands is only a case of abusing those with whom he disagrees. The inference that Mark Twain is only a clown who has no right to say anything that is not funny is another case.

In determining our future course a great country like ours should give full weight to the rights and welfare of the weaker party. If we do stay in the islands as a sovereign we owe it to all parties to end the contest without delay. The want of power to quickly restore vitiates all rights we might possess, and to continue the present condition of affairs is to wrong ourselves and all others concerned.

That the Tagals are not the only people in the islands is met by the fact that they are the dominant race. If there are wild tribes whose political rights the Tagals do not recognize it is not worse than our own case in 1776 when we ignored the rights of Indians and negroes.

JOHN JOHNSON.

Johnsbury, Mc.

For Complete Independence

SIR,—In my opinion, the Philippines should be returned to the rule of their native inhabitants, as the only means of keeping the promise implied in our pledge to Cuba, of maintaining constitutional government at home, and saving the national honor, already seriously compromised.

C. E. D. PHELPS.

New Brunswick, N. J.

"Do unto Others...."

SIR,—Would it have been bad policy for this country to follow the Golden Rule? Instead of buying a people body and soul, and calling them rebels worthy of death when they refused to accept a bargain concerning themselves in which they had had no voice, would it not have been better and wiser to hold to our old traditions? Had we acted the brother instead of the slave-owner would it not have saved multitudes of lives and vast expense? And would not even now a protectorate or such promises as we gave Cuba save the situation? In the minds of all right-thinking people throughout the world would not our cause appear more just, our flag more truly worthy of respect? It is the fashion to call morals and fair dealing mere "sentiment," but the eternal verities remain.

E. S. PHELPS.

New Brunswick, N. J.

Promise Independence

SIR,—It is my pleasure to comply with your request of last week soliciting your readers for an expression of opinion relative to the solution of the Philippine question. Undoubtedly the situation confronting us is a most serious one, and so vital to our future welfare that I do not hesitate to classify the importance of the McKinley administration in a category with that of Washington and Lincoln. For the first time since the Declaration of Independence we seem to be desirous of entering upon a policy apparently antagonistic to the principles upon which our government has been founded, and which have been the key-note of our intellectual, political, and commercial progress for the past century and a quarter. I mean the policy of extending our government to lands situated several thousands of miles from home—a policy which has proved fatal to almost every nation that has adopted it, from ancient Rome down. England has succeeded to a certain extent, we must concede, but England, with all her colonies, has not the roseate future awaiting her that inevitably must be ours, if we adhere to our tested and true heritage, and confine ourselves to the advancement and perfection of this inheritance.

But it is not a condemnation or comment upon the situation that is requested, but a suggestion as to how an honorable and successful solution may be effected. Among the many plans that are suggested for the disposal of the Philippines, the most debated seem to be the following: First, to incorporate the inhabitants of these islands as citizens of the United States. Second, to hold the islands as colonies, and govern them on a plan similar to that of England. Third, to establish a protectorate over the islands, while the inhabitants work out their own independence. And others would have us abandon the islands altogether, and leave the inhabitants to the fate of fortune. All these have their advocates, and the constitutionality, legality, wisdom, and morality of each are questioned. Of all the considerations the legality and constitutionality are the least at the present moment. Therefore, I think best to confine our discussions to the wisdom and morality of the case before us, and as we consider specifically the four proposed plans, to reason from this stand-point.

The fourth proposal, namely, that of abandoning our assumed duty, seems as absurd as it is cowardly. To leave these islands for the aggrandizement of another power would place an ineffaceable stigma upon America's history, and subject us to the ridicule and contempt of all the world. To incorporate the islands would, for many reasons, be impracticable and unwise. It would necessitate equal rights, the consequences of which can be partly appreciated when we call to mind the seriousness of the existing negro problem, to say nothing of the difficulties of governing a people so many miles beyond the sea, and other considerations equally as serious. To imitate England's policy of colonization would antagonize our much beloved and cherished principle of government of, by, and for the people, and would make us, at least in theory if not in practice, an imperial government. So my suggestion for a solution would be one analogous to that of the third in my classification. First of all, by prudent and just means, endeavor to win over the confidence of the Philippines. Promise independence by action as well as word; send officials capable and ready to keep such promises most scrupulously; assist them in every possible way to set up a free and independent government. When confidence shall have been gained, half our battle will be won, and I have no hesitancy in saying that the Filipino, with a human heart sensitive to the feelings of gratitude, will readily grant us any reasonable demands made as a compensation for our expenditures of money, and sacrifice of life, so far as compensation can be made for the latter. I entertain no doubt that by treaty the commercial advantages of the islands could be secured to America first, thereby profiting all that we, as a reasonable nation, can demand. With such a policy perfected Washington's administration as the father of our country, and Lincoln's as the protector, would be supplemented by McKinley's as the savior. America will have won another moral victory, and her Stars and Stripes be revered and honored with a deeper reverence by all nations.

FRANK T. MOLLER.

New York City.

A Duty to Perform

SIR,—I do not think there is any record of a successful experiment in self-government by the peoples of a tropical country. Government by a ruling class (say immigrants from more civilized countries) has also failed, as the immigrant usually sinks to the moral level of the natives instead of raising them to his own. No government has a right to exist that has not for its highest object the good of the governed. The obligation is upon us to do that which in the light of our highest intelligence is best for the people of the islands. To save them from themselves if necessary. The scheme of government outlined by the "Taft Commission" and Spooner Bill" would undoubtedly be preferred to Spanish rule even by the Tagals themselves. The only question, then, is, are the people capable of self-government? or rather, can we entrust the Tagals or followers of Aguinaldo with the government? The large measure of self-government proposed by the Taft Commission will, I think, soon test the natives' capabilities, and give us more and better data.

In my opinion that government which comes from the head of what Americans generally consider the best of governments can and will give them the tutelage necessary before they are fitted for attacking the problems of which they know so little. Humanity, religion, and national honor would be outraged by shirking the task set before us of leading this people from their benighted condition to a realization and enjoyment of the blessings of true liberty, not license.

J. C. LEWIS.

Alto Pass, Ill.

The Ethiopian in the Wood-pile

SIR,—We waged a war against Spain and freed an oppressed and struggling people because they were "of right free and independent," and incidentally because of the destruction of the *Maine*. Having established a stable government, the Cubans are, in law, a republic and amenable to the laws of nations. Should the government of the United States withdraw its representation and troops, the Cubans would be, in fact, "free and independent."

All that the Cubans have gained as life, liberty, and protected property is due to the United States. What a debt of gratitude and weighty moral obligation are here! Will the benefactor take advantage of the situation?

A prominent Republican Senator said that the United States should be regarded as a moral personality. After having rescued two weaker beings from the grasp of a superior, would a sincere and honest man inquire of one of the rescued, "Will you be my lackey and be good to me?" and demand of the other that he give his benefactor his property and be as he? Let the ethicists note this new species of altruism!

For one "Sitting in Darkness" it looks as though Uncle Sam wanted the island of Cuba because of the isthmian canal, and the Philippine Islands because some favored sons have surplus capital to invest, and incidentally because the Administration wants to pose as a world-power in the eyes of the five powers.

E. R. S.

Chillicothe, Mo.

A Governmental Mistake

SIR,—Apropos to the position taken by Mr. Rusk and Mr. Clemens on the Philippine question: Both they and the preponderance of best informed opinion admittedly believe that the acquisition of that territory was a governmental mistake, and regret that complications seemingly prevented the gallant admiral from turning the powers of his fleet homeward with the cessation of Spanish hostilities. But after all pros and cons considered, does not the question revert to this—whether it is better to stubbornly uphold an unjust and recognizedly bad national policy, or to manfully and straightforwardly admit the injustice of the hastily assumed position, and by generous retraction make all possible amends for the administrative or judicial blunder, whatever its source? As with the individual so with the nation will it prove the highest test of courage and the greatest exemplification of generosity and nobility of national character to strive to undo an unpremeditated wrong. It is continually urged that an equitable and honorable withdrawal from our unwarrantably acquired possessions cannot be brought about without loss of national prestige and liability to humiliating ridicule. But was there ever an entanglement so hopeless but there was a satisfactory means of exit were it but assiduously sought for? To quote from Mr. Rusk's recent article, "We may also assure ourselves that one selfish act here or one high-handed, arbitrary act of aggression there is powerless to cast a blot on the escutcheons of the nations." So in regard to the prestige and prowess of the American republic we may assure ourselves that her prestige and protective pugnacity have been proven beyond dispute or disparagement or the power of criticising jeers of jealous aliens to injure. Cannot we better afford to submit to some convictionless taunts than to stifle those feelings and principles received as a heritage from the Pilgrim Fathers from Plymouth's rock-bound coast?

B. F. W. THORPE.

Montclair, N. J.

Get Out

SIR,—The "first vital question involved" is not "What do we want to do?" but "What ought we to do?" I think we ought instantly to acknowledge the independence of the Philippine people and withdraw the United States troops. Then those of us who feel the enormity of the crime committed by the Administration in the name of our country should set up in Manila a monument with this inscription:

ERECTED BY AMERICANS
IN HONOR OF THE MARTYRED FILIPINO PATRIOTS
AND IN BITTER SHAME——

My reasons for this conclusion are given by the officials of the Administration in Senate Document 62, 55th Cong., 3d sect.

FRANK STEPHENS.

Philadelphia, Pa.

Evolution the Method of Progress

SIR,—In discussing Philippine matters, it seems to me that what is often overlooked by those who say that Dewey should have sailed away from Manila as soon as he had destroyed the Spanish fleet is the fact that Dewey did not go to Manila to free Filipinos, but to make war on Spain; and as we were still at war with Spain after he had destroyed the fleet, his next business was to take the city of Manila, and do all the hurt to Spain he could. Really, he took the city when he destroyed the fleet, and held it under the shadow of his guns until Merritt came to occupy it. With the grievances of Filipinos, Dewey and Merritt had simply nothing to do. They were at war with Spain, and the Philippines to them and the world were Spanish territory.

Since February, 1899, Filipinos have been fighting against American sovereignty. First, because some Filipinos want place and power, and they think independence would give them both. Second, because some Filipinos think Americans are wicked giants, who kill babies and drink their blood. Third, because some Filipinos are afraid of other Filipinos, and of midnight assassination. Fourth, because all Filipinos associate foreign sovereignty with oppression, robbery, and deceit. And finally, because Americans have been divided in their councils, their consciences, and their minds, and to quite an extent as ignorant and as prejudiced as Filipinos. Ambition, Ignorance, Prejudice—bad foes these. What can vanquish them? Says General MacArthur: "A great reaction favorable to American interests has set in, in the region of Bulacan, heretofore one of the worst in Luzon. The result has been accomplished exclusively by the long-continued, intelligent, persistent efforts of officers of the Third United States Infantry." And when the Philippine problem is finally solved, it will be owing to long-continued, intelligent, persistent effort, ameliorating, enlightening, inspiring. Step by step, day by day, teaching freedom and self-government, as I conceive it, is American duty. Step by step, day by day, learning freedom and self-government, that is Filipino duty. And as to what will be in the far-off future, when the lesson has been learned, "let the wise years decide."

The way is long? Yes—the lazy are tired and shirk; the timid tell us it is a new way, and old ways are best; others tell us that it is the wrong way, and beseech us to go backward, and preach us dismal sermons, and attack our motives, and malign our characters. And, some who were eager and brave and confident at the beginning begin to doubt and waver, and propose that we try some new way, or make some vow or promise to placate the timid and the pessimists, especially our pupils, who fill the air with their outcries, wanting great things for nothing. But there is also a saving remnant on the way, intelligent, courageous, persistent, and because of this we shall progress, we shall arrive. And what is independence? A name? A form? Or a great reality, hardly won? Can one man give it to another man, or one nation give it to another nation? Has Senator Hoar forgotten "Hail Columbia"?

Let independence be our boast,
Ever mindful *what it cost!*

What did it cost? The blood and tears of '76, or the blood and tears of a thousand years of English history?

Give us independence and a protectorate, cry the Filipinos; but is a country independent that cannot protect itself? Give us independence, cry the Cubans; but will Cuba be independent when America has withdrawn from her soil?

Evolution is the method of all progress. We cannot escape its laws—and, oh! let us rejoice that we have come so far, that we have accomplished so much in the last few years. How can one be an American and not be proud of the record?

Hurrah for our heroes, living and dead! For efficient service, for American manhood, for opportunity met, for difficulties mastered, for work done! For a new dawn of freedom in the islands of the sea!

With a sound of broken chains
Tell the nations that He reigns
Who alone is Lord and God!

L. S.

Mount Washington, Md.

First War, then Peace and Order

SIR,—You invite discussion from the people who have reasons for their belief on that Philippine question. There are a good many people who take very little interest in what becomes of the Philippines, but who, nevertheless, do take much concern in the soldiers and revenue needed from this country to maintain a footing therein; the gentlemen who have gone to the islands to investigate tell us they should be held, on the ground of *manifest destiny*—that is to say, Commodore Dewey wrecked the Spanish fleet, and he had to stay in Manila Bay. The people of this country went wild over that victory, and were in mood to thrash the rest of the world, and this enthusiastic spirit carried all before it. The Pacific coast interests saw therein an opening for future trade, and the trade spirit of the United States is to-day the idolatry of the nation, before which we bow; and there seems no power to curb or check it. This being so, *we assumed the right, because we have the power*, to have and to hold the Philippines against the world, but by what actual, *moral right* (except we paid to Spain twenty million dollars), aside from the material power, has not been clear in my mind. The English colonies claimed the right to the land from the Alleghenies to the Mississippi River over the French claim to the same territory, because the Indians of the Six Nations had thrashed the other Indians, and the Six Nations were as British subjects. Dewey captured Manila Bay, and the race instinct of the Anglo-Saxon pervaded this nation, and no man or set of men were able to withstand the popular demand to keep and to hold whatever land the men of the Anglo-Saxon race and instinct set their feet upon. Where they first step there flows blood, then comes peace. Will the Wise One tell us why?

BENJAMIN HAMMOND.

Fishkill Landing.

The Governors and the Governed

SIR,—In response to the invitation contained in your last editorial, permit me to submit the following, which is not an argument but a mere sentiment. The argument lies in the fact that a sentiment, the legitimate product of evolutionary development, so powerful in South Africa and Luzon, as well as in America, as to claim the sacrifice of life and fortune, cannot be safely ignored by those who would shape the destinies of mankind. Also, if the principle be once established that government abroad derives its just powers from the unfitness of the governed, it would create a *tendency* to exaggerate and emphasize the unfitness of citizens at home, so that in the settlement of the many grave industrial problems that confront us the liberties of the people *might* in time become endangered at the hands of the governing classes—the Manchus of America.

S. M. AUGUSTINE.

San Rafael, Cal.

Uncle Sam, Policeman

SIR,—Permit another of your readers to express his views in regard to our relations with the people released by our recent war with Spain from political submission to that government. There are certain facts that to me clearly indicate the lines of duty.

Our flag, officers, and soldiers are in Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines, and they are there to stay until life and property are as safe in any of these islands as the best of modern civilized governments can make them. The world expects the United States to either provide or guarantee such protection. The responsibility is now ours, however we may have come by it.

There is no proof that the people of any of these islands can now or in the near future provide a government for themselves and by themselves that will be stable, honest, and efficient. The presumption is not that they can do this, but rather that they cannot. Their Spanish training has not fitted them for it. The history of other Spanish-American people affords no hope, unless there is a leader like President Diaz of Mexico to assume immediate and permanent control.

There is no proof that the people of any of these islands can organize a government which, without outside assistance and direction, can escape financial bankruptcy.

The reasons for presuming that they are financially incompetent are the same as above. Nobody would think of going to Spain to learn honesty and efficiency in public finance, and again the experience of other peoples in learning public finance would not lead any one to the opinion that these wards of ours can learn the lesson in a few months.

In view of these facts, it seems to me that the following duties must be earnestly and speedily assumed:

We must provide the conditions that will make it safe for any man, woman, or child of any race or religion to live or travel freely for honest purposes throughout these islands. Whether these conditions are provided by military or civil rule at first is a matter of minor importance as long as the protection is assured.

We must make it possible for investments to be made in any legitimate business without the risk of political revolutions, piratical officials, or hostile taxation. Enormous wealth for the foreign investor and the industrious native waits only for these conditions.

We must provide complete liberty of conscience, entire separation of church and state. In the Philippines the friars ought to be bought out and treated as were the Spanish soldiers—shipped back to Spain. The natives don't want them, and we don't need them.

We must provide an education which will both enlighten and inspire. There are other reasons, aside from the fact that we use the English tongue, for putting instruction in that language within the reach of all as soon as possible.

The questions of independence, protectorate, and statehood are questions for the future, and it is to be expected that both the people of the United States and of these islands will be better able to deal with them than we are now. The most and the best that we can do now is to promise immediate protection in life and property, honest administration of public affairs, religious liberty, and participation in government as soon, and as far, as they show themselves capable.

It seems to me that Cuba ought to be classed with the other islands because all present so many similar conditions. While we have promised Cuba her freedom, yet it is the duty of our country to determine when that freedom shall be given, and under what conditions. I believe that our present Administration has tried and is trying to faithfully perform these duties, and that in the face of many difficulties and hinderances, and I also believe that the President deserves the cordial support of every loyal citizen in these efforts.

(REV.) CHARLES M. STARKWEATHER.

Milton Junction, Wis.

An Assault upon American Principles

SIR,—The President's sinister policy in the Philippines has blotted out the glory of his achievements in Cuba. He has led the Republican party into its first great crime. There has not been in American history a more contemptible and unscrupulous exercise of arbitrary power than the treatment accorded to the noble volunteers who enlisted for the purpose of freeing the Cubans, in compelling them to serve as instruments of conquest in the Philippines.

The censorship in the Philippines I believe to have been a studied attempt on the part of the Administration to withhold from the American people that knowledge of their own concerns which they were entitled to receive. It is of a piece with the President's autocratic and disastrous policy in going ahead in his career of conquest on his own responsibility, without convening Congress, whose province it was to declare war.

The light that has shone past the censors has been but fitful and meagre; but the suspicion will not down that the Administration first kept Punic faith with the Filipinos, and then pursued a policy of deception toward the American public, apparently thinking that the Filipinos could be subdued in a short time, and before the people in this country realized the conditions existing there, and that the result would be then acquiesced in.

I for one am glad to see that Lincoln's saying, that "You may fool all of the people some of the time, and you may fool some of the people all of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time," is turning out to be true, and that some of the really great Americans of to-day are shattering the guilty sophistries of the Administration and its followers.

I do not believe that the best class of American citizens approve the Philippine war. Most of them have been waiting for more light, which the Administration has tried to keep from them. *Prima facie*, and, I think, in reality, the war is a contemptuous assault upon the dearest traditions and noblest principles of the American people. I have discussed the Philippine war with only two of the returned volunteers, both of whom denounce it. One of them did not wish to be quoted, because it would make him unpopular with the stay-at-homes.

The upholding of the Monroe doctrine I believe to be of much more value to us than the possession of the Philippines. Yet how can we consistently uphold it if we send armies to make conquests in the Eastern Hemisphere?

Finally, in my judgment, the cry of "traitor" which assails those who denounce the Philippine war is, where sincere, an outgrowth of the antiquated and feudal idea that the King can do no wrong; and where it is insincerely raised against men of proved patriotism and honor, in order to distract attention from the crimes committed in the Philippines and to delude the unintelligent public, it but reminds one of the celebrated toast, "Patriotism, the last refuge of a scoundrel."

CHARLES E. SACKETT.

Butte, Mont.

With Reference to our Foreign Policy

SIR,—A careful study of Senator Proctor's report of his visit to Cuba, which, more than anything else, precipitated the war with Spain, compared with the actual state of affairs as they were afterwards found to exist in that island, has confirmed me in my original opinion that we became involved in that war without sufficient cause, and that everything which has followed, as a consequence of that war, has proved, or is likely to prove, a mistake. I am unable to see any difference between our present attitude toward the Filipinos and the supposed attitude of the Spanish government toward the Cubans when Senator Proctor made the report to which I have referred. The ground of Spain's refusal to accede to the Cuban's demands was the same as the ground upon which we stand, as we refuse to grant to the Filipinos what seem to them the inalienable rights which they had well-nigh wrested from Spain when the Stars and Stripes, supposed to be the emblem of freedom, appeared upon the scene.

I consider this an act of gross injustice, not only to the people of our newly conquered lands, but to a great multitude of our own people who need the material and educational improvements which the resources which are now being worse than squandered would secure.

In answer to the question, How are we to get out of it? I reply, Get out of it as Great Britain got out of it in acknowledging our independence, and as we asked Spain to get out of Cuba, when we made her refusal the cause of war.

FRANKLIN P. WOOD.

Acton, Mass.

To Err is Human

SIR,— In compliance with your request for opinions on "The Philippine Problem," I have to say: (1) The Administration purchased the islands in obedience to public sentiment, and if it was a mistake, the people should share the responsibility. (2) The Christian Church does not favor subjugation by force, and has no desire that the islands should be retained by that means. Whatever the first religious teachers may have advocated, the religious conscience of to-day does not seek to propagate itself by those means, and any claim to the contrary is a slander upon its good name. (3) If the insistence by the Administration for complete and unconditional submission before defining its policy was ever justifiable, that time has passed. The lack of an authoritative declaration has left everybody in the state of mind of Southey's old Kaspar:

> But what they fought each other for,
> I could not well make out.

(4) Our government should not hold the islands as a dependency, for the reason that it will cost more, both in blood and treasure, than they are worth; and because the business of governing dependencies is in conflict with the idea of free men and free institutions; and because its reflex influence would cultivate an oligarchical tendency which needs no fostering. (5) They should not be made a part of the United States, for their people are alien to us in everything, and not inclined, either by nature or education, to a republican form of government. (6) Our government should at once declare its intentions. It is not difficult to have confidence in our own honorable intentions, although there are some misgivings on this point even among ourselves; but it must be exceedingly difficult for the Filipinos to trust themselves confidingly to our good-nature and generosity, ignorant as they are of the love of justice among us, and the sympathy of our people for the largest measure of self-government and liberty. We should, so far as possible, put ourselves in their place, and deal with the matter from that point of view. (7) There is no occasion for berating the Adminstration for supposed errors, or seeking to cast reflections on its motives. I am happy to believe the Administration may err and still deserve confidence and support. I believe the people and the Administration are both honest enough and brave enough to rectify, so far as possible, any errors made. All understand the subject better now than two years ago, and it is fair to assume the Administration has also learned something. In my opinion it will be best for all concerned to adopt the same line of policy towards the Filipinos as was adopted toward the Cubans, and carry out the same in good faith and with as much expedition as possible. I believe the people at large are rapidly coming to this conclusion. E. A. S.

Gloversville, N. Y.

No Manifest Destiny in This

SIR.—The Philippine Problem, in its final analysis, resolves itself to but one consideration, viz.: What is the right course for us to pursue? It is to be taken for granted that as a nation we want to do what is right, irrespective of whatever humiliation there may be in retracing our steps, or in abandoning hope of commercial gain. It is not always easy to determine what is right, for standards vary, yet there are certain great principles that should govern nations as well as individuals.

The islands do not belong to us, and for the reason that the vender, from whom we profess to have purchased them, was not in possession, and had no legal right. Allowing, for the sake of the argument, that Spain had a technical right to them, this right vanished upon the destruction of her fleet in Manila Bay and the subsequent downfall of Manila. They then passed under the temporary domain of the victors, pending the final adjustment of ownership. We were not the sole victors, nor did we set up a claim to ownership based on conquest, for we paid $20,000,000 as compensation.

In time of peace, and we were at peace with the Filipinos, we determine our duty not only by our own ideas of right but also by those of the other party to the transaction. We were concerned with the Filipinos in the expulsion of the Spaniards, and in justice to them we should have been governed to a large degree by their wishes.

What were the ideas entertained by the Filipinos when they assisted us in the capture of Manila? Evidently that we had come to put an end to Spanish rule and to assure the freedom of the islands. There is no evidence that they even contemplated the substitution of American for Spanish domination. They hailed us as Liberators, not as Masters. Whatever faults they may have, however mistaken according to our conceptions of life and conduct, they cannot be charged with the blunder of supposing that we came to compel their obedience before acknowledging their independence.

Having driven the Spaniards out, with the help of the Filipinos, it was our plain duty to assist them in establishing upon a firmer and a broader foundation the government they had already inaugurated. They strove manfully for independence before we interfered and helped them toward the realization of their wishes. They are fighting now for what they believe to be right. I, for one, do not regard them as rebels against our authority, inasmuch as our so-called title to the islands would have but scant standing in any ordinary court. It is no title at all; it is a subterfuge, and the longer we persist in the present course the longer do we outrage that love of liberty and fair dealing which has made the world better.

The Filipinos are not in arms against any of the fundamental principles of our government for which our fathers fought and died. They are protesting in the only way open to them against the injustice of freeing them from one rule but to impose another.

As to the argument based on "manifest destiny," *that* is sheer nonsense so long as we continue to bury those who oppose us. This country is great enough to retire from a position untenable in good morals, however fortified by appeals to military aspirations that need no excitation, and to commercial dreams that have no foundation. WM. B. PHILLIPS.

Austin, Texas.

Put the Filipinos in Chancery

SIR,—In order to intelligently discuss the status of the Philippine Islands with relation to our government, what is to be our future policy with reference to them, it is important that we should clearly comprehend the present situation. It has been argued that the Filipinos stand in exactly the same relation to us as the Cubans, and are equally entitled to independence. This is not the fact. The two cases are in no sense parallel. We declared war for the avowed purpose of freeing Cuba from the tyranny of Spain, and guaranteed to its people an independent government. We are bound by every obligation of national honor to fulfil his pledge. But in the case of the Philippines we gave no such guarantee. They were not even considered. They came to us as a result of the war, as did Porto Rico and Guam. Whether we paid $20,000,000 for them, or Spain paid us that amount, is of no manner of importance. We had the right to take them without the payment of a single penny. Had Admiral Dewey sailed away after his victory in Manila Bay, he would have been guilty of an act of inexcusable folly. There was a large Spanish force quartered in Manila, and this was as legitimate an objective as Montojo's fleet. Manila was the most important city in Spain's colonial possessions, and its capture and occupancy were of the utmost strategic advantage. Had Dewey been in possession of sufficient force, he would undoubtedly have taken and held the city from the start. Lacking this force, it became necessary to despatch sufficient troops for this purpose. Thus the islands came into our possession as a legitimate result of the war. We acquired whatever title Spain had to them. Her title was by right of conquest, which has been recognized as one of the highest validity from the earliest times. It is as good as our title to our own country acquired by conquest from the Indians. Being thus in legal possession, we were immediately confronted by a native insurrection. Our flag was fired upon. What was our plain duty in the case? Obviously to quell the insurrection at the earliest possible moment, and never haul down the flag until this was accomplished, no matter what our future policy was to be. Peace having first been restored, it would be time to consider the future government of the islands. Suppose after the evacuation of Cuba by the Spanish troops the Cubans had turned upon our forces and attempted to drive them out. Should we have hauled down our flag and withdrawn our forces? Assuredly not. No sane man would have advocated such a course. This is exactly the situation in the Philippines, and until peace is restored there should be no question of withdrawal, even if we ultimately intend to grant them independence.

But the islands once pacified, then what? Ours is the most beneficent government on earth. Its citizens enjoy a larger measure of liberty than those of any other country. Experience has proved this. Why not extend this liberty to the Filipinos? It is said that they do not want it. They prefer independence. The doctrine that all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed has its limitations. There are elements in every municipal society that are governed without their consent—notably the Indians in our own country. The South, following the reconstruction period, was governed without its consent, but no one doubted the right of the general government to do this in the rebellious States. The whole question resolves itself into the consideration of what is for the best interests of the inhabitants of the islands. If this be to become a part of the United States, and entitled to its protecting care, why should we hesitate even if it be against their personal preferences? It is more than doubtful whether they are capable of self-government. That many of them are is undoubtedly true, but surely this cannot be affirmed of the half-savage tribes in the interior of Luzon. If they are incapable of self-government, it would be criminal neglect to abandon them to the rapacity of any foreign nation that might cast longing eyes in their direction. No one doubts that it would be our duty to protect them from foreign encroachment, and this being true, why not protect them from themselves? The Chancery Courts, both in this country and England, exercise a jurisdiction over the custody of children, and will place them where their best interests will be conserved, without regarding the wishes of either parents or children. Why should not enlarged Chancery powers be exercised by a powerful government over these islanders by placing them in a position which will be for their best interests, even though it be against their consent? Whether we become a world power or not, it is our duty to extend the benefits of civilization and Christianity into all parts of the world, and nothing would more surely bring this about in the Philippines than to place its people under the protection of the American flag.

THOMAS W. LLOYD.

Angelica, N. Y.

Scare 'em!

SIR.—"Our plain duty *now*" in the Philippines consists in holding the islands at all hazards. It is of course probable the islands may not yield us wealth or happiness for many years; but who can say the conditions now prevailing will last forever?

The future of the islands must be looked at—the time when they will be civilized, prosperous, and perhaps wealthy—the time of plenty that must come, if not in this, then surely in the next century. If, then, as is my opinion, the islands should be held, my suggestion would be to spend another few millions in ending the struggles of a people who, it seems, cannot see beyond their own nose.

Their subjugation must be forced, and it is possible a vigorous policy would do much in frightening the Filipinos into submission, therefore saving bloodshed.

The abandonment idea, with or without protectorate, is weak. The least reasons for not pursuing it are the twenty or twenty-five millions unaccounted for, and the opening of the way to some other nation even greedier than ourselves to conquer and pillage our victim.

Even after we had secured peace, should it prove we had prepared a bed conducive to insomnia, the comforting fact still remains that the people of this country would not be compelled to lie in it, but could *then* make a Christmas gift of it to the people who *do* believe in its comfort and happiness.

A definite, vigorous, and even hasty policy would, I feel convinced, bring relief—that, as Americans, the people of the United States *must have*—from the dragged-out conditions in the Philippine Islands.

J. E. BOUTON.

New York City.

A Voice from the Coast

SIR,—I believe the people of the Pacific coast are practically unanimous in favor of keeping the Philippine Islands. Probably part of this desire is due to commercialism, but more largely to the fact that we are closer and more nearly in touch with them, and they do not seem so far away as they must to Eastern people.

Personally I believe in the doctrine that the Anglo-Saxon race is destined to civilize a large part of the world, perhaps to dominate over it all, and I believe the Philippine question to be an opportunity to that end. The fact that war is necessary need be no deterrent, from a conscientious point of view, for war is the greatest civilizing force known to history. Our duty to mankind in general should dictate that we retain the islands, and maintain a good government there, even though our duty to the natives may not be so clear.

D. W. COOKE.

Kelseyville, Cal.

Uplift the People

SIR,—I entirely disagree with you when you assert that this country needs an intellectual revival. It needs a moral revival, and if you would confine that to elementary instruction, say in the ten commandments, so much the better.

There is a higher degree of intelligence in this, our day and generation, than at any other time, but this intelligence is confined to business and money-getting. The bulk of our citizens are thus absorbed, and put to it as they are by the present social conditions of great combinations and consolidations of capital and business, they are compelled to concentrate to keep alive, and this struggle begets a hardening and deadening effect upon their moral sense.

I admit that our people have ceased to think as Webster, Sumner, Clay, and Lincoln did. That time and this are not comparable. Then men engaged in business like gentlemen, not like slaves. Business was to them almost like an accomplishment. In no sense was it an absorbing, killing game. They had time to be good citizens, to develop their higher natures and become cultivated and well rounded men.

Money is now the god of the brain of man. Luxury, power, life, death, and insanity are its gifts. When it beckons, men follow to success, or, heedless of warnings, to disgrace and oblivion. To make the people alive to great moral questions, make some other god for them to worship. Give less attention to the giants of finance, whose fortunes only too often have been laid upon foundations of trickery, cruelty, and oppression.

Give more heed to men whose fields of work lie among the great thoughts of science, or in the beautiful and uplifting atmosphere of art, or in ennobling humanitarianism: then again shall we think as they did in the days of Webster, Sumner, and Lincoln.

JOHN ARKEN.